

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being transmitted via the Office electronic filing system in accordance with § 1.6(a)(4).

Dated: November 26, 2010

By: /Mark D. Russett/
Mark D. Russett, Reg. No. 41,281

Docket No.: 64681(70403)
(PATENT)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

5

In re Patent Application of:
Peter W. Gage et al.

Application No.: 10/562,296

Confirmation No.: 3685

Filed: December 22, 2005

Art Unit: 1625

For: ANTIVIRAL COMPOUNDS AND METHODS

Examiner: Nizal S. Chandrakumar

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

10

MS Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

15

Dear Sir/Madam:

Applicants are in receipt of the Restriction Requirement mailed on November 1, 2010 (the “Restriction Requirement” or “Office Action”), in the above-referenced 20 patent application, and now submit this response. This response is timely filed.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Restriction Requirement and request reconsideration on the grounds that consideration and examination of the groups specified in the Restriction Requirement should not impose an undue burden. Additionally, significant expense and time would be saved if all pending claims were 25 searched and examined at this time.

However, to comply with the requirement for restriction and ensure a complete response, Applicants elect the invention of Group I, claims 1-3, 161-163 and 169, as set forth in the Restriction Requirement, with traverse.

The Examiner has indicated that withdrawn process claims containing all the 30 limitations of an allowable product claim will be rejoined pursuant to MPEP 821.04. Applicants further respectfully request that rejoinder of all groups be considered by the Examiner following the search.